



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

International Court of Arbitral Justice, with fifteen judges:

That no nation, large or small, may have the slightest advantage over any other nation, every decision must have the assent of a representative of the largest nations, a representative of the smallest nations, and a representative of the intermediate nations.

First. Divide the participating nations into three groups, putting the largest nations in one group, the smallest in another, and the intermediate ones in a third. Give each group one third of the whole number of nations. (See Note A.)

Second. Provide that each group shall select one-third of the judges, and that every decision shall require the assent of one (or more) of the judges chosen by each group. (See Note B.)

NOTE A. Of course the number of judges and the number of groups may be made different, so long as the principles of absolute equality and of requiring an assent from one (or more) of the judges chosen by each group are adhered to.

NOTE B. The selections in each group may be by agreement, or by a convention of delegates, or by a lot from a list of nominees, or by a system of sub-groups, or otherwise.

NOTE C. If a commission of three judges is to be chosen to sit between sessions, it should include one from each group.

### What the Peace Organizations Are Doing.

The Kansas Peace Society, with headquarters at Wichita, is planning to celebrate the eighteenth of May this year with a two-days' meeting, at which the principal speakers will probably be Charles M. Sheldon and William Allen White, both of Topeka. With two such men as these, known and honored everywhere, the Wichita pacifists ought to be able to fill the biggest hall in the city, and to add several hundred members to their peace society.

The seventh British National Peace Congress will be held in Edinburgh June 13 to 15 this summer.

The International Arbitration League of Great Britain has issued a pamphlet signed by forty-two out of the forty-six Labor Members of Parliament, by all the members of the Council of the Federation of Trade Unions, and by hundreds of working class leaders, in all nine hundred and sixty-eight. The manifesto warns the working classes that at a time when Continental workers are crying out against the evils of conscription, a military clique in England is engaged in a well-organized conspiracy against their liberties. Compulsory service in any form is pronounced bad, as unnecessary for home defense, and as involving an addition of many millions a year to the already crushing burden of armaments, and so a serious menace to democratic progress.

The Council of the Interparliamentary Union will hold its spring meeting at Brussels on the 8th of this April. The Council is composed of two members from each country. The next conference of the Union will be held at Rome beginning on October 24.

### Brevities.

. . . The Pan-American Arbitration Treaty, a convention providing for the submission of pecuniary claims to arbitration, signed on August 11, 1910, at the Fourth

Pan-American Congress, has been ratified by the United States.

. . . Oscar T. Crosby, president of the World Federation League, a section of the New York Peace Society, gave a dinner in Washington recently to thirty-five members of Congress, Senators and Representatives, to discuss practical legislation to advance the cause of peace. Among the speakers, besides members of Congress, were the Ambassadors from France and The Netherlands. The special topic considered was the work of the Peace Commission authorized by Congress last spring, but not yet appointed by President Taft. Mr. Crosby, in an interesting address, set forth the plan of work formulated by the League for the work of the Commission when appointed. The League is proposing, if possible, to send some representative abroad to assist in getting some of the leading powers to appoint similar commissions.

. . . The following resolution was adopted by the Cincinnati Methodist Episcopal Ministerial Association on February 27:

"Whereas, We are deeply interested in the world peace movement; and,

"Whereas, We believe that the neutralization of the Panama Canal would greatly promote this cause, and at the same time would preserve to the United States the entire control of the canal, and secure to her the profits arising from its use; therefore

"We hereby memorialize the President, the State Department and Congress to take immediate action to secure the complete and permanent neutralization of the canal by the consent and coöperation of the civilized nations of the world. And we protest against the fortification of the canal, and request Congress to withhold appropriations for that purpose, until every effort to secure neutralization shall be shown to be futile.

"We earnestly hope that this great triumph of engineering skill, the greatest conquest over nature's obstacles ever undertaken by any national government, may stand as an invitation to peace, not a challenge to war; that it may be another link in the chain that should bind all the nations of the earth in one great brotherhood."

. . . Count Leo Tolstoy, Jr., who is now in this country, is deeply interested in the cause of peace, but in a more immediately practical way than was his distinguished father. He is desirous of bringing about an agreement between the United States, England, Germany, France and Russia, so as to eliminate any possibility of war. He has had an interview on the subject with Mr. Carnegie, and during his three-months' stay he will take advantage of every opportunity to promote interest in it. We shall all be immensely grateful to the Count if he can put forward some plan for the proposed agreement that will work.

. . . The British naval estimates for 1911-12, submitted to the House of Commons last month, amount to \$220,000,000, \$20,000,000 more than last year, as those of last year were \$20,000,000 more than those of the preceding year. Five new Dreadnaughts are to be laid down this year as last. Seventy-five millions of dollars of the estimates are for new constructions.

. . . A treaty of arbitration between Italy and Norway was signed on the 6th of December, 1910. On the 25th of January this year the treaty of arbitration between Italy and Russia, signed on the 27th of November last, was ratified by exchange of notes at St. Petersburg.

. . . President Nicholas Murray Butler, writing to the American Peace Society on the relations between the international peace movement and the two American countries immediately concerned in the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Ghent, says: "In my judgment the undefended boundary between the United States and Canada is the model and ideal toward which the opponents of militarism, huge armaments and war should direct their efforts. On either side of this long imaginary line, two great busy, ambitious and independent peoples have managed to live and work together for more than one hundred years. Has this fact not given to Canada and to the United States the right to lead in the movement for international peace?"

### Commissions on Limitation of Armaments.

The following letter has been sent by the International Peace Bureau at Berne, signed by the president and general secretary, to all the governments of the world:

TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS:

*Sir:* Your attention has, without doubt, been called to the fact that on June 25, 1910, the Congress of the United States of North America authorized the creation of a Commission charged with the examination of the most appropriate means for bringing about a limitation of armaments, which, according to the expression of the Czar in his manifesto of 1898, "weigh heavily upon all the nations and by their exactions reach and paralyze the public welfare at its very source."

It appears from a communication made by Mr. Taft, President of the United States, on the 6th of December, 1910, that the appointment of the members of this Commission has been delayed because of the inaction of other governments which have been invited by him to inform him of their intention likewise to create Commissions with the same end in view.

In the name of the large number of societies connected with the International Peace Bureau, we urge that a favorable response be given by your government to the communication sent out by the American government. The formation of a Commission, whose purpose will only be that of investigation, does not constitute in any manner a pledge as to steps which may afterwards be taken. It will only give evidence that the desire, often expressed by the governments, to lessen the crushing burdens which actually rest upon the people, is a reality and not a meaningless phrase.

There is no doubt that at the present time the nations are suffering from the situation brought about by armed peace, and that the maintenance of this armed peace in the present conditions places an obstacle in the way of the reforms which are imperatively necessary to assure the moral and material progress of humanity.

We are convinced that this appeal, which we are making to you, will not be in vain, and that you will be glad to transmit it to your government and to solicit therefrom a favorable response to the initiative taken by the government of the United States of North America.

Thanking you in advance for the kind consideration which you may give to this communication, we beg of

you, Mr. Minister, to accept the assurance of our high consideration.

For the Permanent International Peace Bureau,  
H. La Fontaine, *President*. A. Gobat, *General Secretary*.

### Sir Edward Grey's Response to President Taft's Advance.

In his great speech on Armaments in the House of Commons on March 13, Sir Edward Grey spoke as follows, amid continual cheers, in response to the suggestions of President Taft in regard to an unlimited treaty of arbitration between the two countries:

"I can see but one thing which will affect this naval and military expenditure on the wholesale scale in which it must be affected if there is to be real relief and assurance. You will not get it till nations do what individuals have done, and that is come to regard an appeal to law as the natural course for nations instead of an appeal to force.

"Public opinion has been driving in this direction. Twice within the last twelve months the President of the United States has sketched out a step in advance in arbitration more momentous than anything that any practical statesman in his position has ventured to say before, and pregnant with far-reaching consequences. I should like to quote the two statements of the President of the United States. Here is one: 'Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or national proprietorship. I know that is going farther than most men are willing to go, but I do not see why questions of honor may not be submitted to a tribunal composed of men of honor who understand questions of national honor, to abide by their decision, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations.'

"The other statement is this: 'If we can negotiate and put through a positive agreement with some other nation to abide by the adjudication of an international arbitral court in every issue which cannot be settled by negotiations, no matter what it involves, whether honor, territory, or money, we shall have made a long step forward by demonstrating that it is possible for two nations at least to establish between them the same system of due process of law as exists between individuals under a government.' Those are bold and courageous words.

"We have no proposal before us, and unless public opinion will rise to the level of discussing a proposal of that kind, not with reference to charges of inconsistency, not with reference to whether one nation or another is going to gain particularly by some agreement — unless it can rise to the height of discussing it as a great movement in the opinion of the world, it cannot be carried out. But supposing it took place, supposing two of the greatest nations of the world were to make it clear to the whole world by an agreement of such a character as that, that under no circumstances were they going to war again, I venture to say that the effect upon the world at large of the example would be one which would be bound to have beneficent consequences. It is true that two nations who did that might still be exposed to